



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Dr. Krause makes the interesting suggestion, which explains many features of Diogenes' circulatory system, that his ideas were obtained, not from dissection of the human body, which certainly was not customary in his day, but from animals. The vital organs of animals were very familiar to the Greeks, because the examination of them was one of the commonest methods of divination. An excellent diagram accompanies this portion of Dr. Krause's work.

CLARA E. MILLERD

Lo Stato e l'Istruzione Pubblica nell' Impero Romano. Da CORRADO BARBAGALLO. Catania: Francesco Battiato, 1911. Pp. 430. L. 6.

"Public instruction in Europe is wholly of Italic origin." These are the first words of the Introduction to Barbagallo's book on *The State and Public Instruction in the Roman Empire*, and certainly in the truth of this statement is justification enough for the most detailed study of the educational institutions of the ancient Romans. For purposes of comparison with modern institutions, however, a study of the schools of the Republican period is not enough; we need also to understand those of the Empire, for it was in the Empire that the schools received their fullest development. Barbagallo has undertaken in the present work to explain the connection of the central government with public instruction in the period from Augustus to Justinian; the work is therefore an exposition of the development of the educational side of the imperial polity during the first five centuries of the Roman Empire. The most notable feature of this polity was the increasing interference of the emperor in matters of oversight and control relating to the schools—interference that led in the end to a form of public instruction not unlike that which is the most common form of public instruction in Europe at the present day.

Barbagallo has performed his task well, and the result is a book of great value and interest. It was not a part of Barbagallo's plan to give an account of the inner workings of the schools or a complete picture of the schools as they were at any one period of their existence, and these things we do not find in the book. But we have a discussion, at once clear and acutely reasoned, of the various acts of the emperors in succession from Augustus to Justinian relative to the subject of education. Only in a subordinate way is the relation of the various municipalities to the teachers and schools touched upon. Though the method of treatment is annalistic, the book is organically constructed; the outlines of the structure as a whole and the bearing of the different parts on each other are not lost sight of in the discussion of details.

Some of the more important conclusions of Barbagallo's study may be summarized thus: Two different theories of public instruction existed

at different times among the ancient Romans; one was that which prevailed under the Republic, the other was that which came into existence under the Empire. According to the first of these theories, the state has no concern with the establishment or the maintenance of schools or with the instruction that is given in them. According to the second, the ideal state is that which provides instruction at its own expense and under its own direction. The latter theory was developed gradually out of the former, and this development took place in three ways: (a) by the establishment of public and official schools; (b) by the regulation of municipal instruction; and (c) by the oversight given to private instruction.

In the institution of state schools two methods were at different times followed: either (1) the state established in important cities, like Rome and Athens, chairs of certain studies, delegating, perhaps, to the local councils the privilege of appointing the incumbents of the chairs, but assuming to itself the burden of paying the salaries, or (2) it designated certain cities where certain studies, already established, should be pursued under imperial patronage and without inconvenience from competition of other cities; a case of this sort was the school of Berytus, reorganized by Justinian. Schools of the latter kind do not appear earlier than the time of Diocletian.

In these two forms of state institutions we have the beginnings of the real university, wherein the state took charge of all branches considered fundamental or necessary. Such a real university was the Capitol at Constantinople, reorganized (not established) by Theodosius II. The branches considered fundamental or necessary were oratory, "grammar," philosophy, and, toward the end of our period, law. The tendency was for the central government to concern itself more and more and in more and more ways in the affairs of the schools. Thus, in some places, as at Rome and Constantinople, it furnished the university building, or, again, it made regulations relative to the conduct of the students. This activity of the central government, except in a few cases, affected solely the external features of the schools; it did not interfere with the freedom of instruction.

The second way in which the development of the ancient theory of education took place was through the regulation by the state of municipal instruction. Such regulation is to be noted as early as Antoninus Pius, by whom the privilege was granted, or the obligation imposed, on certain municipalities of supporting chairs of certain subjects and granting exemptions from certain public duties. The municipal councils acted in these cases as the representatives of the emperor, who occasionally interfered in person.

In the matter of private instruction the policy of the central government was in the line of restriction as regards all but the lower grades. The emperor Julian, by requiring that every teacher of higher learning who wished to set up a school should first receive permission from the local council of the city in which he wished to teach, as well as the consent of the

emperor, took one step in this direction; and still further restrictions were imposed upon private teaching by Theodosius II. Under this emperor only house-to-house teaching was left unregulated.

It would be impossible to give here an idea of the many interesting points that are discussed in the course of this treatise. Especially noteworthy is the discussion of the emperor Julian's attitude toward the schools. Barbagallo is inclined to assign greater importance to the influence of Nero in the line of education than most authors, and less importance to that of Vespasian. The appointment of Quintilian, for example, signified rather the personal advancement of a distinguished teacher than the foundation of a real chair of eloquence. The influence of Hadrian, it is held, was chiefly in the way of encouragement to education; real educational chairs did not come into existence until the time of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. Besides the more strictly educational institutions, space is given in the book to such subjects also as libraries, museums, galleries, the maintenance of works of art, etc. Some points invite comment, of which but a few can be mentioned here.

Of the two chairs of rhetoric at Athens in the second century A.D., Barbagallo believes the one to have been an imperial donation (of Marcus Aurelius) and the other a municipal chair established under Antoninus Pius. This is Zumpt's view, and that which on the whole seems the more probable. Brandstätter's view, however, that the chair held by Lollianus was a chair of *political* oratory, would seem to deserve notice. Barbagallo refers to Brandstätter's article elsewhere in a different connection.

Barbagallo states that at the death of the sophist Julian at Athens, about 340, a change was made in the number of official chairs of sophistry in that city, so that in the future there were to be six such chairs instead of a single chair. This view is based on one, and, in the reviewer's opinion, not the most probable, interpretation of a doubtful passage (Eunap., p. 79). We may well doubt whether Athens was honored with six imperial chairs of sophistry (there were only five such Greek chairs at Constantinople in the next century, and apparently three at Antioch in this century), especially as certain passages (e.g. Lib. i. 19. 16; 59. 3) seem to intimate but three.

Mention is made by Barbagallo of the salaries said to have been established at Antioch by the emperor Probus; these salaries, he believes, were to be paid by the municipality. This may have been the case; we miss, however, reference to those passages in which salaries in various cities are said to have come from the emperor, and, in general, we should have liked a full discussion, with citation of passages, of the difficult question of the respective relations of the emperors and the municipal councils to the schools in the fourth century. A summary statement of some of the facts has, it is true, been given in the final chapter, but apparently all the passages bearing on the subject have not been used.

The services of the emperor Constantius in the field of education are

spoken of at length, but no mention is made of the adverse judgment of Libanius (e.g. iii. 436. 18) and others on Constantius.

Barbagallo states (p. 223) that Constantine was the first emperor to extend privileges to members of the family of a teacher. Hadrian, however, is said (Philos. 532) to have extended to Polemo's children the privilege of traveling by land or sea free of charge.

These are comparatively slight matters, however, in part involving but questions of personal judgment, and do not detract from the value of the book as a whole.

J. W. H. WALDEN

The Separation of the Attributive Adjective from Its Substantive in Plautus. By WINTHROP L. KEEP. [*University of California Publications in Classical Philology*, Vol. II, No. 7, pp. 151-64. Berkeley, 1911.]

Such impropriety as may be involved in my reviewing an abstract of a dissertation of which I suggested the subject may be condoned by the fact that the close criticism of the thesis in its later stages was in more competent hands. My interest in the theme prompts some general remarks that may be suggestive to future investigators.

The earliest Latin prose is said to exhibit the close juxtaposition of the attributive adjective and its substantive; rarely a word or two intervenes, in that case of an enclitic nature or constituting a single unit of thought. Contemporary poetry clearly shows greater freedom. Later prose shows greater freedom, though the extent and nature of it remain as yet undefined. Is it possible to trace any historical development in this matter? Is the greater freedom of later prose a reflection of the freedom that grew up naturally under metrical and stylistic conditions peculiar to poetry in the earliest period of Latin? Or did rhythmical conditions and other factors within the prose itself after it became more consciously artistic promote separation? Such are some of the questions I hoped to see partially answered in the present paper. The writer in his abstract has intelligently described some phases of the question in Plautus; such criticism as I should be disposed to make concerns rather omissions than errors of statement. These omissions are perhaps due to the abbreviated form in which the paper appears.

The writer starts with a generalization for which I crave all the evidence. He declares that close juxtaposition is normal in Plautus and all early poetry before 100 B.C. The mere proof of this statement would be of more value than the content of the abstract. The implication is that the examples of various sorts discussed in the abstract are not real, but only apparent, violations of the norm. But, however we may abhor statistics, some figures are necessary to convince us of the norm; a single play of Plautus would